

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/067,212		MIZUTANI ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Kaj Olsen		1753	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kaj Olsen. (3) _____

(2) John Fitzpatrick. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 February 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, 11/12 Makino.
Plautner, new reference Stahl Stahl

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicants representative discussed making 11012 independent to overcome Makino. The examiner also introduced Stahl (and its WIPO publication) which the examiner considers relevant to the instant invention

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required